

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested. Entry of this Amendment under Rule 116 is merited as it raises no new issues and requires no further search.

Claims 5-9 and 14-18 are pending in the application. Independent claims 5 and 14 have been amended to incorporate claims 19 and 20, respectively. Claims 19 and 20 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been introduced through the foregoing amendments.

The Examiner's rationale in the last two sentence on the continuation sheet of the Advisory Action is noted. The Examiner's attention is kindly directed to page 4 of the Request for Reconsideration filed November 19, 2003, where it was clearly pointed out that the applied references fail to disclose, teach or suggest that the sheet carrier is **completely** removed in the step of removing the sheet carrier, as previously recited in claims 19-20 and now amended claims 5 and 14.

In the section below, Applicants will address the Examiner's rejections raised in the Final Office Action in turn.

After reviewing the description set forth in col. 3, lines 2-20 as well as col. 5, line 56 to col. 6, line 13 of Coffman, the Applicants found that the photoresist layer 32 is applied to overlay the surface 23 (see Fig. 2) of the metal sheet 20 (see Col. 2, line 60-63) and then patterned as illustrated in Fig. 3. Coffman is formed within cavities formed by half-etching a metal layer. However, Applicants have amended independent claims 5 and 14 to define over the applied art of record, solely for the purpose of expediting prosecution. More particularly, amended claims 5 and 14 now require that said sheet carrier be ***completely*** removed in the step of removing the sheet carrier after the package body is formed.

Applicants respectfully submit that Coffman does not teach or suggest the claimed step of *completely* removing the sheet carrier after a package body is formed since the sheet carrier 126 in Coffman is only *partially* etched (see Fig. 17) but not completely removed as presently claimed.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Coffman fails to teach suggest or disclose each and every limitation of amended claims 5 and 14, and request that the rejections be withdrawn.

Since it has been shown that amended independent claims 5 and 14 overcome the art rejections, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejections of claims 6, 9, 15 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as they depend from independent claim 5 or 14.

**Rejection of claims 7, 8, 16, and 17 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over
Coffman (6,451,627) in view of Bernier et al. (6,251,707)
and Bunyan (U.S. Pub. 2002/0012762)**

This rejection is traversed, at least for the reason advanced with respect to independent claims 5 and 14.


Accordingly, all claims in the present application are now in condition for allowance. Early and favorable indication of allowance is courteously solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN GILMAN & BERNER, LLP



Benjamin J. Hauptman
Registration No. 29,310

USPTO Customer No. 22429
1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 310
Alexandria, VA 22314
(703) 684-1111 BJH/KL/klb
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: January 2, 2004